

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the non-final Office Action dated July 14, 2006, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the application. With this Response, claims 1-3 and 7-11 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this Response. Thus, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Request For English Translation

In the Office Action, the Examiner requested a translation of the foreign priority documents relied on in the present application for obtaining foreign priority benefits under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The Applicants' representative contacted Examiner Ma on October 13, 2006, to briefly discuss the English translation. During the discussion, it was noted that there was a slight delay in receiving the English translation. The Examiner stated that it would be acceptable for the English translation to be submitted at a later date. Accordingly, the Applicants will submit the English translation of the foreign priority documents in due course.

II. Response To Claim Rejections

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Youngs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,600,918, hereafter "Youngs"). Claims 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wegener et al (U.S. Patent no. 6,490,432, hereafter "Wegener") in view of Youngs. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 11 have been amended to further distinguish over the cited references. As amended, the claims point out that the data transmitted to a mobile telephone includes textual content of a television program concurrently being broadcast. This feature is not believed to be disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited references. Additionally, this feature is fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure (see, Applicants' Application, page 5, line 15-page 6, line 11).

By contrast, Youngs discloses mainly transmitting just a television program to a mobile device. The only textual data transmitted relates to a list of available programs, and this list is transmitted before the broadcast to allow for the selection of programs for viewing (see, Youngs, col. 4, lines 21-39). Thus, there is no textual data transmitted that relates to a concurrent or live

broadcast. To this end, Youngs fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least the features recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 11 (as amended).

Moreover, Youngs fails to disclose, teach or suggest the following features recited in dependent claims 2 and 3 (as amended): 1) transmitting data to trigger the recording of a television program; and 2) transmitting data as an SMS (see, Applicants' Application, page 1, lines 21-24 and page 6, lines 14-16). Thus, dependent claims 2 and 3 are distinguished over Youngs on their own merit.

Finally, Wegener fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Youngs. Therefore, even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to combine the teachings of Wegener and Youngs, the combination still would not teach or suggest all the features recited in at least claims 1-3, 10 and 11. Likewise, dependent claims 4-9 and 12-14 are also distinguished over Youngs in view of and Wegener based on their dependency from independent claims 1 and 11.

III. Conclusion

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that claims 1-14 of the present application are patentable over the cited references. The Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Director is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket no. (112740-300) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY Mark D. Pratt
Mark D. Pratt
Reg. No. 45,794
Customer No. 29177
Phone: 202-955-7003

Dated: 10/16/06